IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

WEDNESDAY, THE 25TH JULY 2007 / 3RD SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 22819 of 2007(N)

PETITIONERS:

----

1. RENUKA, W/O VELAYUDHAN,
KANDAMKULATHI HOUSE, ARANATTUKARA,
THRISSUR.

2. SREERENJINI, W/O SIVAN,
CHULLIPPARAMBIL HOUSE, THRIKKUMARAMKUDAM,
AYYANTHOLE, THRISSUR.

3. SILVY, W/O DAVIS,
PULIKKOTTIL, KANNANKULANGARA,
CHIYYARAM, THRISSUR.

4. SHEELA, D/O SIDHAN,
PARIYARATHU VALAPPIL, KANNANKULANGARA,
CHIYYARAM, THRISSUR.

5. AJITHA, W/O RAMAKRISHNAN,
PURANDEKKATTIL, NEDUPUZHA,
KANIMANGALAM, THRISSUR.

6. JALAJA, S/O MANI, PAYANGOTTUPARAMBIL,
NEDUPUZHA, KANIMANGALAM, THRISSUR.

7. SINDHU, W/O PRADEEP,
VAKAYIL VEETTIL, NEDUPUZHA,
KANIMANGALAM, THRISSUR.

8. BEENA, W/O DAVIS, PULLUPARAMBIL,
VADOOKKARA, KANIMANGALAM, THRISSUR.

9. ELSY, W/O JOHNY, THEKKETHALA HOUSE,
VADOOKKARA, KANIMANGALAM, THRISSUR.

10. BASHEELA, D/O BASHEER,
KARUPPAM VEETTIL, KANNANKULANGARA,
CHIYYARAM, THRISSUR.

**11. VALSA, W/O GEORGE KOMBARAKKARAN,
KIZHAKKUMPURAM, MANAKKODY, THRISSUR.**

BY ADV. SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

RESPONDENTS:

**1. CORPORATION OF THRISSUR,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.**

**2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT,
GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

**BY ADV. SRI.K.B.MOHANDAS,SC,THRISSUR CORPORATION
GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT. N.SUDHADEVI**

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 25/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,J.

WP(C)NO.22819 OF 2007-N

Judgment

The petitioners have approached this Court, challenging Decision No.2 in Ext.P3 minutes of the Corporation of Thrissur, containing the decisions taken by the Council on 02.06.2007. The Corporation, by Resolution No.3 dated 22.11.2004, decided to entrust the work of spot billing of water meters to the Kudumbashree units in Thrissur on a remuneration of Rs.4 per house. An agreement was also signed between the Corporation and the Kudumbashree unit and based on that agreement, 11 members of the said organisation were deputed to take the meter reading. Now, the Corporation by decision No.2 in Ext.P3 has decided to engage Meter Readers through the employment exchange. The result is that the petitioners may be thrown out. Hence this Writ Petition, challenging the said decision.

2. The petitioners have no legal right to say that they should be continued to be engaged as their employment is covered by the conditions in Ext.P1. Normally, the vacancies in public service should be filled up by hands sponsored by the employment exchange or the Public Service Commission. So the decision taken in Ext.P3 is a valid and proper decision. The petitioners have no locus standi to challenge the said decision. But, the learned counsel for the petitioners pointed out that they have preferred Ext.P4 representation before the Government and there

may be a direction to the Government to consider the same. The petitioners have no legal right to get the relief sought in Ext.P4 and the Government do not owe any duty to them in this regard. Therefore, there is no point in directing the Government to consider Ext.P4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition fails and it is dismissed.

25.07.2007 **K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,JUDGE**

sta